THE REMONSTRANCE
AGAINST WOMAN SUFFRAGE

BOSTON, APRIL, 1917

The Remonstrance is published quarterly by the Women's Anti-Suffrage Association of Massachusetts. It expresses the views of women in Massachusetts, Maine, Rhode Island, New York, Nebraska, Iowa, Pennsylvania, Michigan, Connecticut, Maryland, New Hampshire, Vermont, New Jersey, South Dakota, West Virginia, Wisconsin, Ohio, Virginia and other states.

Any one who desires to receive the quarterly numbers for one year can do so by enclosing 25 cents in stamps to the Treasurer,

MRS. JAMES M. CODMAN,
Walnut St., Brookline.

Information in regard to The Remonstrance and other publications of the Association may be obtained from the Secretary, Room 615, Kensington Building, Boston.

Women's Anti-Suffrage Association of Massachusetts

One hundred and forty-three Branch Committees; 39,573 members in 443 cities, towns, and villages*

MRS. JOHN BALCH, President.
MRS. GEORGE R. AGASSIZ
MRS. ROBERT S. BRADLEY
MISS ANNA L. DAWES
MRS. LOUIS A. FROTHINGHAM
MRS. CHARLES E. GUILD
MRS. CURTIS GUILD
MRS. FRANCIS C. LOWELL
MRS. HENRY M. WHITNEY
Vice-Presidents
MRS. JAMES M. CODMAN, Treasurer
Walnut Street, Brookline

Education and Organization Committee
Chairman
MRS. WM. LOWELL PUTNAM

Publicity Committee
Chairman
MRS. HENRY PRESTON WHITE

Branch Organization
Chairman
MRS. THOMAS NELSON PERKINS

Membership Committee
Chairman
MISS JULIA C. PRENDERGAST

Meetings Committee
Chairman
MRS. HAROLD MURDOCK

Public Interests League
President
MRS. B. L. ROBINSON

College Anti-Suffrage League
President
MRS. HERBERT LYMAN

Recording Secretary
MRS. RANDOLPH FROTHINGHAM

Corresponding Secretary
MRS. STEPHEN S. FITZGERALD

** Net present membership of women over 21 years of age; eliminating those names which the Association has lost from deaths, resignations, and removals from the State*

MEMBERS ARE EARNESTLY REQUESTED TO KEEP HEADQUARTERS ADVISED OF CHANGES OF ADDRESS.

WOMEN AND "PEOPLE"

It hardly seems probable that even Miss Blackwell herself, who stood sponsor for the proposal that the word "people," as used in the sixth section of last year's act providing for holding a constitutional convention, should be construed to include women, expected that the Legislature would take the proposal seriously.

If she did, she must have been grievously disappointed, for the House turned the bill down by a rising vote of 94 to 31; not enough members favoring it to demand a roll call.

The essential absurdity of the proposal is shown in an article from the Boston Herald, reprinted in another column. The word "people" is clearly defined in other sections of the act as persons "entitled to vote for state officers," as women certainly are not; and the attempt to read a different meaning into it in the sixth section was intended to get, by quibble and subterfuge, the right to vote which the voters of Massachusetts, by practically a two to one majority, and after full consideration, refused no longer ago than November, 1915.

AN UNTRAINED ELECTORATE

In June, 1915, Hon. Henry L. Stimson, former Secretary of War, wrote:

The passage of the woman suffrage amendment in New York this fall would mean the immediate participation in the government of this state of two million voters, the vast majority of whom are not only utterly without political experience or training, but have not even had the slightest experience in those matters of business which naturally lead up to and train for public affairs.

This utterance drew down upon Mr. Stimson the usual suffrage criticism and abuse; yet the essential truth of it is admitted by Lillian B. Millard, who, reporting to the Woman's Journal the results of the suffrage canvass of New York women, writes:

Those of us who have taken part in the personal canvass have been amazed at the ignorance of women regarding public affairs, and surprised that the mind of the average woman should run in such narrow grooves.

When suffragists are forced to admit that most women are not fitted by training, experience, or interest in public affairs to vote intelligently, they are apt to reply that it will be a good thing to "educate" them. But surely it is an expensive policy of education which proposes, at a time when state and national questions of the gravest character are demanding settlement, to double the electorate by putting the ballot in the hands of women who not only do not want it, but cannot use it intelligently.

SECTION 122 of the Constitution of North Dakota provides that "No law extending or restricting the right of suffrage shall be in force until adopted by a majority of the electors of the State voting at a general election." That distinctly shuts out such a measure as the statutory suffrage bill; but the present Legislature seems disinclined to allow a little thing like a clause in the Constitution to stand in its way.

ANTI-SUFFRAGISTS

ARE READY TO RENDER ANY SERVICE AND MAKE ANY SACRIFICE POSSIBLE FOR THE NATIONAL HONOR.

BUT THEY CAN DO THIS AND SHOULD DO IT WITHOUT ABANDONING THEIR WORK FOR THE ANTI-SUFFRAGE CAUSE.

A TIME OF NATIONAL STRESS AND INTERNATIONAL COMPLICATIONS IS THE LAST TIME TO PERMIT REVOLUTIONARY CHANGES IN OUR SYSTEM OF GOVERNMENT SUCH AS THE SUFFRAGISTS SEEK.

THE ANTI-SUFFRAGE MOVEMENT IS CONSERVATIVE, CONSTRUCTIVE AND, IN A TRUE SENSE, PATRIOTIC.

WITH A CONSTITUTIONAL CONVENTION ABOUT TO ASSEMBLE IN THIS STATE, AND AMENDMENT CAMPAIGNS IN PROGRESS IN MAINE, NEW YORK AND OTHER STATES, THE CONDITIONS CALL FOR INCREASED ACTIVITY AND GENEROUS GIVING.

THE COLLEGE LEAGUE

THE College Anti-Suffrage League held a meeting, February 15, at the residence of Mrs. Thomas Allen, the head of the Advisory Board, at which Mrs. Annie Riley Hale was the speaker. The League elected as officers: Mrs. Herbert Lyman, President; Mrs. Robert M. Blackhall, Vice-President; Mrs. Talbot Aldrich, Miss Edith Buckingham, Miss Ethel Freeman, Miss Heloise Hersey, Mrs. Samuel Hoar, Mrs. Lee McAllister, Miss Lucia Russell, Miss Agnes Rothery and Miss Chrystel Wilkins, Honorary Vice-Presidents; Miss Emily MacFarlan, Secretary; Miss Eleanor Huse, Treasurer.

A large Advisory Board was also formed, consisting of Miss Harriet E. Johnson, Mrs. George A. Sweetser, Mrs. Joseph Hoppin, Mrs. C. H. Woodbury, Miss Kate J. Knott, Mrs. Edward Kinsley, Mrs. Ellis Spear, Jr., Mrs. A. J. George, Mrs. Herbert Magoun, Miss Adelaide Proctor, Mrs. William A. Drew, Mrs. C. P. Strong, Miss Jean L. Kendall, Mrs. Frank W. Merriman, Miss Alice L. Robinson, Miss Josephine Baker, Miss Ruth F. Howe, Mrs. F. H. Daniels, Mrs. A. S. Apsey, Mrs. F. A. Pemberton.

The officers and Advisory Board represent Radcliffe, Smith, Wellesley, Boston University, Tufts, Wheaton, Mt. Holyoke, Simmons, Institute of Technology, Vassar, Bryn Mawr and the University of Michigan. The object of the League is to affiliate college women opposed to suffrage for work among college graduates and for the presentation of anti-suffrage views to students in colleges where the suffrage side is given a hearing. Several hundred college women are now enrolled in the League, and the membership is growing rapidly. There are no membership dues, but subscriptions in aid of the work will be gladly received by Mrs. Herbert Lyman, Readville, Mass., to whom also applications for membership should be sent.

WOMEN LEGISLATORS

THE Woman's Journal points exultantly to the fact that there are eleven woman members this year in the Houses of Washington, Montana, Arizona, Utah and Oregon. But it omits to mention the fact that there are 322 male members of the same legislative bodies. The ratio of 11 to 322 does not suggest that there is any crying demand for women as lawmakers in the States which have given women the ballot. Oregon, which had two woman members in its House two years ago, has only one this year. It is in polygamous Utah that the representation of women has doubled,—rising from two in 1915 to four this year.

THE OHIO SUFFRAGE BILL

OF the various suffrage measures pressed this year upon legislatures, the most iniquitous is the so-called Reynolds bill, enacted by the Ohio Legislature, and signed by Governor Cox on the 21st of February.

The Legislature which enacted this bill, and the Governor who signed it, knew that they were acting in defiance of the clearly-expressed will of the electorate. Twice within the past five years, the voters of Ohio have expressed their views upon the suffrage question. In 1912, they rejected a proposed suffrage amendment by a majority of 87,455. Two years later,—the suffragists having insisted upon another test of popular opinion—they defeated the amendment by a majority of 182,905. The suffragists do not dare to go before the voters again, and so they have persuaded the Legislature and the Governor to give them Presidential suffrage over the heads of the voters.

The Cincinnati Times-Star of February 7 said very truly:

"The fundamental law in Ohio provides that the people, not the Legislature, shall be the final authority. No action of the General Assembly—barring certain emergency acts—can be binding until there has been an opportunity for a referendum. Probably there will be such a referendum if the Reynolds presidential suffrage bill passes; and if the vote is against the measure, the action of the Legislature will be nullified. The Supreme Court could not allow the Ohio Legislature to enact a presidential suffrage bill, free from interference by a popular referendum, without overthrowing the entire system of direct popular government which has been built up in many of the States."

The question cannot be regarded as settled in Ohio until this referendum is taken. And when it is, it is probable that the popular indignation against this repeated pressing of the question will manifest itself, as it did in 1914, by a largely-increased anti-suffrage majority.

RHETA CHILDE DORR is a voluminous and sprightly suffrage writer, but it would do her good and would do her cause no harm if she took pains to verify some of her statements before turning them over to her syndicate. In the Boston Record of January 30, she says that the Susan B. Anthony amendment to the federal constitution, "when passed by a two-thirds majority in the Senate and House, and ratified by the legislatures of at least 24 states, will give all American women full citizenship." A very little research would have shown her that there are 48 states in the Union, and that it requires the affirmative vote of 36 of them to ratify an amendment to the federal constitution.

THE ARKANSAS suffrage bill gives to women the right to vote at primaries, and requires them to pay a poll tax, to meet all the requirements of male voters, and to swear to support the candidates of their party. How they are to do this last when they are not permitted to vote at elections is not clear to the ordinary mind. The bill carries with it one of those "emergency clauses" which suffragists rely upon to secure immunity from a referendum, but petitions for a referendum are already in circulation and will be filed within the prescribed limit of time. In South Dakota, two years ago, the Supreme Court ruled against a similar use of the "emergency clause."

"STATUTORY SUFFRAGE"

THE latest attempt of the suffragists to secure the ballot without what they describe as the "humiliation" of appealing to the voters is the concerted effort which they are making this year to persuade the Legislatures to enact what are described as "statutory" suffrage bills,—that is, bills modeled after that passed in Illinois in 1913, which gives women the ballot for Presidential electors, and for municipal officers and for other offices created by statute.

All such legislation is of doubtful constitutionality; and it should be borne in mind that, so far as the Illinois statute is concerned, the question of the constitutionality of Presidential suffrage has never yet been tested. Moreover, the suffrage leaders in that state are admittedly unwilling that it should be tested.

When the Supreme Court of Illinois, by the close division of four to three, sustained the validity of the law, the question before it related to a municipal election; and the decision of the Court was based on the ground that, by the uniform construction that had been given to the Illinois State Constitution, the Legislature had complete power to regulate the election of all officers who were to fill offices created by the State Legislature itself. But the Court held that the Legislature had exceeded its powers in so much of the Act as related to all questions submitted to the vote of the electors.

What the decision of the Court might have been if the question before it had related to the election of Presidential electors may not be confidently affirmed.

Since the opinion referred to was handed down, the Illinois Supreme Court has rendered two decisions circumscribing the political powers of women. In February, 1916, all of the seven justices concurring, it decided that women could not vote for precinct, ward and state committeemen, nor for delegates to national conventions. In April, 1916, the Court ruled, four to three, that, at the election of city judge in the city of Macomb, only the votes of men should have been counted, as all courts are either directly or indirectly created by the judicial article of the Constitution, and it is therefore beyond the power of the Legislature to grant women the right to vote for them.

The framers of the Constitution of Illinois inserted a provision restricting the suffrage to *"male citizens of the United States,* above the age of 21 years." That provision still stands. Has the Legislature any right to override it? So high an authority as Mr. Justice Cooley, in his work on Constitutional Limitations (7th ed.) 902, says:

"Wherever the Constitution has prescribed the qualifications of electors, they cannot be changed or added to by the Legislature or otherwise than by an amendment of the Constitution."

That principle certainly applies in every State where the Constitution limits the suffrage to male voters. It is true that the Constitution of the United States provides for the appointment of Presidential electors "in such manner as the Legislature thereof shall direct." Under this clause, the Legislature may itself appoint Presidential electors, or it may provide for their choice by the voters, but, if it takes the latter course, as all the Legislatures now do, it has no right to run contrary to the State Constitution. No one can imagine that the framers of the Constitution of the United States intended to confer upon State Legislatures the power to do that which they were prohibited from doing by the State Constitutions.

That the Illinois suffragists are themselves aware of the precarious character of the privileges given by the limited, statutory suffrage law is plain from the statement made by Helen Stewart, 2d Vice-President of the Illinois Equal Suffrage Association, in the Woman's Journal for Feb. 26, 1916:

"We did not feel it at all wise to allow the matter of our whole bill to be brought up before the Supreme Court, even for the sake of voting for the important offices that were in question at this time."

ANOTHER "DRIVE" THAT FAILED

IT will be remembered that the "drive" of the Woman's Party, alias the Congressional Union, in the full-suffrage states last November, was directed both against President Wilson and Democratic candidates for Congress. Women voters were urged to vote against both on the ground that they "opposed political freedom for women."

As to the "drive" against the President, it was a complete failure. As was pointed out in the January REMONSTRANCE, the President carried ten of the twelve states in which women voted, although seven of the ten were normally Republican. The two states which he failed to carry—Illinois and Oregon—are strongly Republican.

But how about the "drive" against Democratic candidates for Congress? The eleven full-suffrage states had seventeen Democrats among their Representatives in the last Congress. They have *exactly the same number in the new Congress.* In the country at large, the Democratic party lost ground, its membership in the House falling from 228 to 215. That it held its own in the suffrage states shows at least that the "drive" of the Woman's Party did it no harm, if it was not an actual asset.

THE New York Call, Socialist-feminist-suffragist organ, is highly indignant because some of the suffrage leaders have accepted what the Call, in its issue of February 18, describes as "the spurious issue of patriotism." The Call attributes this action to "the poisonous presence of the monster, War," and deplores the action of suffragists in changing "the historic slogan 'suffrage first' to 'Patriotism first.'" Probably the Call would put patriotism last, if it found any place at all for it.

THE SUFFRAGE "PICKETING" OF THE WHITE HOUSE

What the Newspapers Thought of It

AN UNSEEMLY SPECTACLE

(From the Springfield Union, Jan. 13, 1917)

THE picketing of the White House by any organization whatsoever is an unseemly spectacle, repellent to good taste and in violation of a due sense of respect for the national executive. It is very likely to lead to disorder and trouble of a serious nature before the experiment is much older.

AFTER "GOOD COPY"

(From the Chicago Herald, Jan. 13, 1917)

They cannot be so ignorant of the Wilsonian habit of mind as to imagine that picketing would persuade the President to change his position. . . . Why then do the zealous young women continue to expose themselves to the hardships of wintry picketing? As reasonable people they know that the President will be unmoved—except to personally friendly expressions. Can it be that the pickets are merely "good copy"? Is it possible that their campaign is the product of a press agent's fertile fantasy? No other rational explanation of the suffragists' psychology is apparent.

PETTY AND MONSTROUS

(From the New York Times, Jan. 11, 1917)

No one can imagine the Socialists, the Prohibitionists, or any other party conceiving of a performance at once so petty and so monstrous; one could not imagine even the I. W. W. attempting it. . . . Yet nobody is astonished that woman suffragists should propose such a thing, and therein lies a matter of deep concern in dealing with the whole woman suffrage question. The granting of suffrage would intrude into governmental affairs a great body of voters comprehending many whose minds do work in just that way, a great many to whom that compound of pettiness and monstrosity seems natural and proper. It would introduce into the management of the Government many persons so constituted that they can see nothing wrong in trying to influence the President himself by duress when they cannot convince him by argument. That the female mind is inferior to the male mind need not be assumed; that there is something about it essentially different, and that this difference is of a kind and degree that with votes for women would constitute a political danger is or ought to be plain to everybody.

SOMETHING BESIDES SILLINESS

(From the Gloucester Times, Jan. 22, 1917)

There is something here besides silliness. The women are presuming upon their sex and upon the chivalry of men. Men doing what they are doing would have been arrested long ago. Men who had attempted to enforce their views in such fashion would meet swift rebuke. For, after all, these women have forsaken the method of reason. They are not willing to abide by the law and wholesome progress of their cause. But they must bully an official into favoring them, must try to tire him out until he reaches the point where to get rid of them, he will do what they want. . . . Do these women, think you, by what they are doing, show their fitness for sharing in the government?

WOMEN'S SPECIAL PRIVILEGES

(From the Northampton Gazette, Jan 13, 1917)

Only women will ever be allowed to "picket" the White House and annoy the President. The first man who attempted it would be arrested and carried off to jail in ten minutes. Except so far as the ballot is concerned, women are either very thoughtless or very disingenuous when they complain of inequality. It is the men who could complain did not chivalry restrain them, for by common consent the female sex is a privileged one, exempt from obligations imposed on men and entitled to many concessions and considerations that men would never dream of claiming. Such is the ruling not merely of custom but even of the statutes of all our states. Laws requiring absolutely "equal rights" would fill the women of America with dismay.

LET THE PICKETS ALONE

(From the Cincinnati Times-Star Jan. 17, 1917)

Indignant at not being dragged from the White House, the suffragists have now organized a picket at the portals. Whenever the President enters or leaves the Executive Mansion, the pickets flaunt before him banners bearing the slogans of their cause. It is evident that this last example of "lady-like" behavior is getting on the nerves of Washingtonians and others who are old-fashioned enough to believe that the President of the United States is entitled to some respect. Representative Emerson, a Republican from Ohio, has gone so far as to protest on the floor of the House against the picketing.

This is all wrong. Let them alone. There are some things in this life which are of such nature that any irritation displayed imparts to them undeserved dignity.

FOR ADVERTISING OR FOR SUFFRAGE?

(From the Boston Traveler, Jan. 11, 1917)

It may be that the suffragists will accomplish something worth while by their silent picketing of the White House. It is probable that they know what they want, and perhaps it is not the business of mere man to tell them what to do and what not to do.

But there are certain activities of the modern suffragists which cannot be understood by their friends among the males who already have the right to vote. It is true, however, that among the leaders of the cause today there are women who would rather be advertised by arrest for breaking the laws than obtain what they are nominally seeking. It is true that among them are women who, using neither common nor uncommon sense, ran a "million dollar special" into the West last fall for the purpose of exhibiting their costly raiment and flimsy arguments to the women voters of the West, and telling them who should be their choice for President.

They got the advertising that they were after, but in getting it they cost the Republican party thousands of votes in the territory visited by them. Picketing the White House may have its uses for advertising purposes, but it won't affect the President's position in the slightest degree, and it won't make one vote, in Congress or out, for the cause of equal suffrage.

ANTI-SUFFRAGE LUNCHEON

THREE hundred and twenty members and guests attended the annual luncheon of the Women's Anti-Suffrage Association of Massachusetts at the Hotel Somerset, February 16th. Mrs. John Balch, of Milton, President of the Association, presided, and presented a resolution, which was adopted enthusiastically by a standing vote, pledging the Association to give loyal support to President Wilson in the maintenance of the nation's honor.

The principal speakers were Miss Emily P. Bissell, secretary of the Anti-Suffrage Association of Delaware, Chairman of the Social Service Committee of the Delaware State Federation of Women's Clubs, and State Secretary of the Red Cross Society; and Mrs. Annie Riley Hale, of Washington, D. C., author of "The Eden Sphinx," a book which has attracted wide attention by its discussion of fundamental woman problems.

Miss Bissell emphasized four encouraging facts: The failure of the suffragist attack upon President Wilson for his refusal to endorse the Federal amendment, suffrage states which were normally Republican giving him a majority in spite of the Congressional Union campaign against him; That the President begins his second term with the people behind him in opposing the Federal amendment; That suffragists are now completely discouraged regarding constitutional amendments calling for popular votes and are thrown back upon such partial suffrage as they can get through legislatures; and That the Congressional Union tactics, the disregard of all established forms of etiquette and courtesy at Washington, the interruption of the President's address to Congress by the flaunting of a suffrage banner, and the picketing of the White House had so disgusted public sentiment as to work to the advantage of the anti-suffrage cause.

Mrs. Hale declared that the anti-suffrage movement is not negative, but constructive. It seeks to promote greater efficiency on the part of women. So far from woman filling both man's place and her own in the world, she said, she has never yet demonstrated that she could fill her own. Every man's failure in the state presupposes some woman's failure in the home. Woman government antedates state government throughout the world's history. It may not hurt a woman to vote, as the suffragists argue; but it does hurt a woman to want to vote enough to go the lengths that women are going in this country. Woman's job is the biggest job in the world, and the constructive woman movement is to train her to fit that job. The state has at present all that it can stand in taking care of the irresponsible male voters that she has contributed to the world.

Personal tributes were paid by Mrs. Balch to the late Mrs. Henry F. Durant and Mrs. Helen Kendrick Johnson, both of whom had been prominent in the anti-suffrage movement; and Mrs. William Lowell Putnam, appealing for funds for the state work, and to aid the National Association,—an appeal which met with a generous response—urged that such contributions would be especially gratifying to the Treasurer, Mrs. James M. Codman, because of the severe accident which had restricted her activities.

THE PROHIBITION WAVE

SINCE 1914, a prohibition wave has swept over a large part of Europe and the United States. In Europe, it began with the sweeping edict of the Tsar of Russia, early in the war, under which the traffic in vodka, which had been a source of huge revenue to the Government, was absolutely prohibited, with a resulting advantage in military and industrial efficiency which, in the opinion of competent observers, abundantly justified it. It spread to France, and is now extending to Great Britain, though in less drastic form.

In the United States, no less than 16 states voted for prohibition in the years 1914-1916. The suffragists make much of the fact that seven of these sixteen states are states in which women vote; and they renew their ancient and often-refuted claim that prohibition and woman suffrage go hand in hand. A phenomenon which they make no attempt to explain is that, prior to the rise of the prohibition wave in 1914, not a single state had been carried for prohibition through the aid of women's votes. Prior to 1914, there were nine prohibition states, every one of them made so by the votes of men. Kansas was in this group, but Kansas voted for prohibition in 1880, twenty-two years before it became a suffrage state.

What has happened, therefore, is that, since 1914, the suffrage states as well as the male-suffrage states, have felt the force of the prohibition wave.

IT is in suffrage Kansas that a bill has been introduced in the Legislature to penalize qualified voters who do not vote.

THE Woman's Journal describes the statutory-suffrage bill, passed by the Indiana Legislature, as conferring "nine-tenths woman suffrage." But, under its provisions, women cannot vote for Governor, or for state officers named in the constitution, or for members of the Legislature, or for Congressmen. Do not these omissions constitute rather a large tenth?

IT was the Dutch woman suffragists who originated the idea of "silent picketing" as a means of advancing their cause. For nearly four months, from September to January, they stationed women at the doors of the Dutch Parliament, as an appeal for favorable action on their proposal to include "votes for women" in the revised constitution. But the Parliament proved obdurate, and the pickets were withdrawn after final adverse action was taken.

AS TO WEST VIRGINIA

MRS. CARRIE CHAPMAN CATT'S enthusiasm for the suffrage cause has led her to make a good many rash and unsupported charges, but none more rash or with less support than the charge that woman suffrage was defeated in West Virginia by fraud.

It is rather difficult, to begin with, to conceive of any form of fraud so widespread as to account for an adverse majority of 98,067 out of a total vote of 225,147. It would have taken a good deal of money to buy up 161,607 voters, leaving only 63,540 incorruptible voters to vote for suffrage. Where could the money have come from? The usual suffrage explanation is that the saloons give it. But the saloons in West Virginia had been driven out of the state several years before by a drastic prohibition law. If they had not money enough to save themselves from annihilation, it is scarcely probable that they would have had either the means or the disposition to pour out money like water to defeat woman suffrage.

Before the election, the Ohio County (W. Va.) Equal Suffrage League, possibly in the hope of establishing proof of fraud, offered a reward of $100 "for the apprehension and conviction of any person guilty of purchasing or otherwise illegally influencing votes against the equal suffrage amendment at the November election, 1916." So far as the public knows, no one has ever claimed this reward, and the $100 remains in the treasury of the Ohio County League.

Mrs. Catt professes to know that "evidences of fraud and irregularities are so numerous that it would take a book properly to record them," and she mentions one woman—name and place not given—who, in a small precinct, saw all but six of seventy-five voters receive money for their votes. Why does not this woman come forward and claim the $100 reward offered by the Ohio County League?

In reply to an inquiry from Mrs. Arthur M. Dodge, Mr. E. T. England, Attorney General of West Virginia, wrote that he had heard no charges of fraud in connection with the defeat of woman suffrage. If the West Virginia suffragists had any evidence of the sort, they would scarcely have failed to bring it to his notice, so that the guilty persons might be indicted.

Mrs. Catt has made similar charges of fraud in connection with the defeat of suffrage in Nebraska, going so far as to say that the Attorney General of the state in 1914 had said that the amendment was "counted out." But Mr. Grant G. Martin, who was Attorney General of Nebraska at that time, in a letter dated Oct. 7, 1916, denies that he ever made any such statement or that he had ever heard any one make a charge of fraud in the count.

Cannot some one persuade Mrs. Catt to be a little less reckless in her accusations?

THE SCHOOL VOTE

THAT is an apt phrase which the Boston Traveler uses, in an editorial quoted in another column, in which it describes the suffragist women of Boston and Massachusetts as refusing "the half loaf" of school suffrage.

The immediate occasion of the Traveler's comment was the election last December in Boston, at which, the Traveler says, "fewer than 20,000 women qualified to vote for school committee and of that number only 45 per cent. voted." The vote was even more significant than the Traveler states it, for only 10,946 women registered, and only 4,987 voted. At the same election, 84,552 male voters went to the polls.

When the proposal to confer school suffrage upon women was before the legislature of 1879, two arguments were strongly urged in its favor. One was that the direct share of women in the administration of the schools would greatly improve educational methods. The other was that the school vote would test the desire of women for the ballot. If they used, steadily and generally, the school vote, it would prove that they wished a larger share in public affairs, and an extension of the franchise would follow. That the schools have in any way profited by the participation of women in the election of school boards remains to be demonstrated. But that any advantage can come to them so long as only a handful of women voters—on the average, less than 4 per cent.—take the trouble to go to the polls, seems extremely doubtful.

As to the other argument, suffragists wisely refrain from using it. Year after year, they have urged women to vote for school committee, so that the size of their vote might be a proof of the desire of women for the ballot. But the results have been so disappointing that they resent indignantly any argument drawn from them.

The legislators of 1879, who had been assured that women were eager for the school vote, must have been surprised at the way in which the supposed boon was received. In Boston, in 1881, only 748 women registered, and 640 voted; in 1882, 567 registered and 498 voted; in 1883, 701 registered and 650 voted; and so it went on, until in 1888, stimulated by one of those gusts of sectarian passion which sane people deplore, the registration of women rose suddenly from less than 1,000 the year before to 20,252, and the vote to 19,490, only to drop to about one-half of those figures the next year, and thereafter to keep on sagging.

In view of these facts, it is not strange that the suffrage leaders do not "point with pride" nowadays to the women's school vote.

THE Chicago Journal of Jan. 18, said, editorially: "Despite the fact that women have full suffrage in twelve states besides a partial vote in Illinois, THE REMONSTRANCE. solemnly declares that the suffrage movement is a failure." Will the Journal be kind enough to enumerate the twelve states in which women have full suffrage?

WHY SO DIFFIDENT?

WHY is it that the Illinois Equal Suffrage Association, under the leadership of Mrs. Grace Wilbur Trout, has been vehemently opposing this year the resolution for the submission of a suffrage amendment to the State Constitution?

Under the partial suffrage bill, which was smuggled through the Illinois Legislature four years ago, Illinois women have been voting for municipal officers and for Presidential electors. According to suffragist representations, great benefits have resulted. "Wet" towns and cities have been carried over to the "dry" side; better municipal officers have been chosen; and women have shown an amazing appreciation of their new privileges.

If these things are so, what better time could there be for seeking full suffrage? Would not the benefits already accomplished be an unanswerable argument for extending the voting privilege?

How does it happen then that we find Mrs. Trout declaring that "To submit a suffrage amendment to our present Constitution would be fatal"?

And why is it that that strenuous suffrage paper, the Chicago Tribune, said editorially, in its issue for February 5:

"Real friends of woman suffrage in the Illinois Senate will vote unhesitatingly against the resolution to submit a suffrage amendment to the people in 1918. The passage of this resolution will set back the cause of suffrage in this state, as leading suffrage organizations fully realize. They are opposing the resolution because they have the foresight to see failure, not success, in the premature submission of a separate amendment."

Are not these declarations practically an admission that the existing partial-suffrage law is so far from working well, and so far from commanding the approval of the people that the suffragists are convinced that it would be a fatal error to allow the people to vote on a full-suffrage amendment?

"HI" GILL AGAIN

An Associated Press despatch from Seattle, Washington, on the 27th of January, contained the following information regarding a public official who has been a good deal in the public eye:

"Mayor Hiram Charles Gill, Chief of Police Charles L. Beckingham and ex-Sheriff Robert T. Hodge, with a number of others, were indicted by the federal grand jury late today on three counts charging conspiracy with the Billingsley bootlegging ring in America's largest dry city.

The indictments were returned after the Billingsleys charged that they had paid Mayor Gill $4,000, Aug. 29, 1916, to dismiss a number of city cases against them, return documentary evidence of their violation of federal laws and agree to protect them in plying their bootlegging business."

This is the same "Hi" Gill, whose election as Mayor of Seattle in 1914 the Woman's Journal described as "a victory for the right."

It is also the same "Hi" Gill about whom Mr. George Creel, in his Century article in March, 1914, wrote:

"Hi" Gill was the open and avowed champion of the saloon and disorderly house. He insisted that they were necessary to the prosperity of Seattle. The climax of this policy was reached when two huge municipal brothels were erected in a public street. It was then that the people recalled him, 22,000 women voting, each woman an anti-Gill committee of one."

Yet, in the spring of 1914, when this same "Hi" Gill presented himself again for election, standing this time on a nice, new reform platform, a majority of the Seattle women who voted rallied to his support. So also did the saloon-keepers, who apparently knew their man better than the guileless women voters and the imperfectly-informed Woman's Journal. If the charges on which he has now been indicted are true, it would seem that his administration has been at least a financial success, whatever may be said of it as "a victory for the right."

REFUSING THE HALF LOAF

(Editorial in the Boston Traveler, Dec. 27, 1916)

MALE advocates of equal suffrage have waited patiently for a long time for the women leaders of the cause to tell why it is that, having a half loaf at their disposal, they refuse to accept it until the whole bakery is run on day and night shifts for their benefit.

For years the women of Massachusetts have had a right to vote for members of school boards. No more important voting duty could devolve upon them. Upon the choice of school board members rests to a very large extent the value of the public schools, and women should have a deeper interest in the effectiveness of those schools than man has ever disclosed. If women are to make good in electing presidents, governors, mayors and members of legislative bodies they should first make good in choosing the men and women who will supervise the education of their children.

In this commonwealth the partially enfranchised refuse to rise to their opportunities. Only when a bitter and even nasty sectarian issue has been raised have the women of Boston ever shown any large inclination to vote. This year fewer than 20,000 women qualified to vote for school committee, and of that number only 45 per cent. voted. Is that good judgment? Is it good politics?

THE National Equal Suffrage Association would like, if it could, to rid the suffrage cause of all responsibility for the militant methods of the Congressional Union. Mrs. Ida Husted Harper, chairman of its National Press Committee, in the New York Times of January 30, describes the Congressional Union as representing "about 2 or 3 per cent. of the enrolled suffragists of the country," and explains that it "depends for its existence almost wholly on 'publicity.'" But the Union has State organizations in 37 States, and has raised a fund of $250,000 to carry on its publicity and militant work. Probably its leaders regard the National Association as representing not more than 2 or 3 per cent. of the suffragists of the country. The suffrage cause cannot so easily unload responsibility for its methods.

SUFFRAGE VIOLENCE

Reference was made, in the January REMONSTRANCE, to the organized attempts of the suffragists to break up anti-suffrage meetings during the 1916 campaigns in South Dakota and West Virginia, and in particular to the demonstrations of Mrs. Elsie Benedict of Colorado at Brookings and other South Dakota towns.

Miss Blackwell, writing editorially in The Woman's Journal of January 20, quotes the following statement from THE REMONSTRANCE article:

"At Brookings, Mrs. Benedict, when told by the manager of the theatre where the anti-suffrage meeting was being held that she must leave her banners outside, charged upon him, struck him in the face and called names, and then ran down the aisle, shrieking questions to the speaker."

This statement Miss Blackwell characterizes as "an extreme instance" of "wild fictions" circulated in anti-suffrage literature "too gross to be believed even by those who send them out."

But what has Miss Blackwell to say to the following statement, signed by Mr. E. H. Carlisle, the manager of the theatre referred to, and also by Mr. Nels Gulick, Chief of Police, and Mr. William M. Holmes, Assistant Chief of Police:

"Being the manager of the opera house in question, and having leased the same for the evening for the use of the anti-suffrage speakers, Miss Bronson and Mrs. Jacobsen, I was at the box-office and entrance looking after the seating and handling of the people. The meeting was under way and the speaking had been going on for some time without incident, when a number of persons came from a suffrage meeting which was being conducted by Mrs. Benedict on the street more than a block away. Most of the people were carrying suffrage pennants and banners on sticks, which I considered would be a disturbance to the meeting and an annoyance to the speakers, and considering myself, as manager of the house, responsible for the good order of the meeting, I requested these people to leave their banners at the box-office until after the meeting. They complied without protest until Mrs. Benedict, with her immediate followers, numbering probably fifteen or twenty persons, came to the door. I requested these people, as I had those already in the hall, to leave pennants and banners outside. Mrs. Benedict, in a loud and boisterous tone and manner, refused to do this and defied me to attempt to stop her entrance to the house with her banner. I respectfully told her that she would be welcome if she would leave her banner outside. She became very angry and abusive, and rushed by me, with her banner, to the door of the auditorium, when I caught her with my arm, and took her back to the entrance, she striking me several blows about the head and face with her fists.

"Mrs. Benedict then removed her pennant and entered the auditorium with the others. . . . This constitutes the only and all the physical force that I used upon or against Mrs. Benedict on this occasion. I neither struck nor kicked her, nor attempted such a thing. Her statement in the interview in the *Public Opinion* is wholly and absolutely false and can be so proven by a number of eye-witnesses to the affair. I would say that the Chief of Police, Mr. Gulick, and his assistant, Mr. Holmes, who were present in the hallway at the time, will substantiate this statement in every material feature."

This they did, as has been already stated. Moreover, Prof. R. F. Kerr, an ardent suffragist, in a letter published in the Sioux City Journal for November 4, 1916, corroborated the foregoing statement in every particular, declared that Mrs. Benedict's tactics "lost votes for the cause of suffrage" and protested to Mrs. John L. Pyle, the leader of the South Dakota suffragists, against such methods.

Miss Blackwell observes that "to any one who knows Mrs. Benedict, comment would be superfluous." Perhaps it would. But does it never occur to Miss Blackwell that, instead of passing lightly over such hysterical demonstrations of violence, or treating them as anti-suffrage fictions, it would be wise to condemn them strongly? She went so far last year as to admit that "Any suffragist who is guilty of rudeness in public hurts the cause." But, if that is true of a single act of rudeness, what shall be said of an organized campaign of violence such as the suffragists carried on in South Dakota and West Virginia, of which what occurred at Brookings was only a single incident? And what impression is the average man likely to get of the probable consequences of "votes for women" when he sees this type of woman coming conspicuously to the front?

THE "PEOPLE" QUESTION

(Editorial in the Boston Herald, Feb. 19 1917)

THE Legislature refuses to construe the word "people" as used in the sixth section of last year's act providing for a constitutional convention to include women.

The suffragists who made this proposal seem to have overlooked the fact that the word "people" is used half a dozen times in the act in question, and it might be confusing if it were construed to mean one thing in one section and a different thing in another. The sixth section, which the proponents of the bill wanted construed so as to include women qualified to vote for school committee, is that which provides for submitting "to the people" such revisions or alterations or amendments as the convention may frame.

But the first section of the act, which provided for "ascertaining the will of the people" as to whether a convention should be held, expressly says that the vote shall be "in accordance with the laws relating to votes for state officers" and that a majority of such votes in the affirmative "shall be deemed and taken to be the will of the people." The eighth section refers to the Governor's proclamation "calling upon the people to elect delegates" and the fifth section provides that, at the special election thus called for "every person then entitled to vote for state officers shall have the right to vote."

THE Ohio suffragists did not dare to include municipal suffrage in the Reynolds bill. That measure is not a "statutory suffrage bill" after the Illinois pattern, but a presidential suffrage bill only, amending the existing school suffrage law by adding the words "and presidential elector" and leaving the limitation "and upon no other question."